



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/772,382	02/06/2004	Larus Gunnsteinsson	GUNN3001/JEK/JJC	5746
23364	7590	01/31/2006	EXAMINER	
BACON & THOMAS, PLLC			KAVANAUGH, JOHN T	
625 SLATERS LANE			ART UNIT	
FOURTH FLOOR			PAPER NUMBER	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			3728	

DATE MAILED: 01/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/772,382

Applicant(s)

GUNNSTEINSSON ET AL.

Examiner

Ted Kavanaugh

Art Unit

3728

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 13-20 and 22-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 13-20 and 22-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/6/2004 + 9-13-2004
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 13-20,22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US 2004/0002671 (Reaux).

Reaux teaches an orthopedic leg cast (64) or splint (see all the figures and specifically figure 8) that has structure as claimed including a sock structure (16,18) comprising elastomeric fibers woven into glass fiber textile (see paragraph #17) carrying an activatable hardenable compound (see paragraph #21); a compliant flexible, non-porous, elasticized liner (see paragraph #16 and more specifically the last sentence which teaches the liner can repel water and therefore non-porous); an inner stocking member (padding material, see paragraph #26,29 and 33) and spacer elements (padding material, see paragraph #26,29 and 33). The padding can represent either the inner stocking member or the spacer elements. Regarding claim 17, the core spacer

Art Unit: 3728

elements (the padding) can inherently be applied at the toe and dorsal regions of the foot. Applicant is claiming (e.g. claims 13-21) a "kit" and not the method of making the last.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 2004/00002671 (Reaux).

Reaux teaches an orthopedic leg cast having structure as claimed (see the rejection above) except for the flexible elastomeric liner being made out of silicone. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct the liner out of silicone, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

5. Claims 13-20,22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5228164 (Graf et al) in view of US 2004/00002671 (Reaux).

Art Unit: 3728

Graf teaches a kit for preparing an anatomical model of a foot as claimed including:

- a sock structure comprising elastomeric fibers woven into glass fiber textile (see col. 3, line 26 to col. 4, line 13) carrying an activatable hardenable compound (see col. 5, line 45 to col. 7, line 43,

- a compliant flexible liner (Graf teaches using two stockings one of which could be the liner and Graf teaches a tubular polyester rib-knit (col. 12, lines 41-45) which also could represent the liner),

- a pourable and settable polyurethane material (filler material – see col.7, line 63 to col. 8, line 58),

- an inner stocking member (col. 4, lines 48-50 and col. 11, lines 23-25, and

- spacer elements (see col. 9, lines 12-15 and col. 1, lines 29-31).

Regarding claim 17, the wedges and the like taught at col. 9, lines 12-15 can inherently be applied at the toe and dorsal regions of the foot. Applicant is claiming (e.g. claims 13-21) a “kit” and not the method of making the last.

Graf lacks the flexible liner being a non-porous elastomeric material but does teach other material can be used to protect the foot, see col. 8, line 67 to col. 9, line 6. Reaux teaches the liner or stockinete can be fluid repellant (waterproof) to keep the underlying skin dry, see the middle to end of paragraph #16. Moreover, it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary

Art Unit: 3728

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct the liner of Graf out of a waterproof liner to further protect the foot. Regarding the liner being made out of silicone, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct the liner out of silicone, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed Jan 5th, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that claim 14 was not addressed in the last office action.

In response, claim 14 is a product-by-process claim and therefore A product-by-process limitation adds no patentable distinction to the claim, and is unpatentable if the claimed product is the same as a product of the prior art. The determination of patentability in a product-by-process claim is based on the product itself, even though the claim may be limited and defined by the process. That is, the product in such a claim is unpatentable if it is the same as or obvious from the product of the prior art, even if the prior product was made by a different process. *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695, 697, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

7. Applicant's remaining arguments with respect to claims 13-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

9. Applicant is duly reminded that a complete response must satisfy the requirements of 37 C.F. R. 1.111, including:

-“The reply must present arguments pointing out the *specific* distinctions believed to render the claims, including any newly presented claims, patentable over any applied references.”

--“A general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references does not comply with the requirements of this section.”


-Moreover, “The prompt development of a clear issue requires that the replies of the applicant meet the objections to and rejections of the claims. Applicant should also specifically point out the support for any amendments made to the disclosure. See MPEP 2163.06” MPEP 714.02. The “disclosure” includes the claims, the specification and the drawings.

10. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). Other useful information can be obtained at the PTO Home Page at www.uspto.gov.

In order to avoid potential delays, Technology Center 3700 is encouraging FAXing of responses to Office Actions directly into the Center at (571) 273-8300 **(FORMAL FAXES ONLY)**. Please identify Examiner Ted Kavanaugh of Art Unit 3728 at the top of your cover sheet.

Any inquiry concerning the MERITS of this examination from the examiner should be directed to Ted Kavanaugh whose telephone number is (571) 272-4556. The examiner can normally be reached from 6AM - 4PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mickey Yu can be reached on (571) 272-4562.


Ted Kavanaugh
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3728

TK
January 24, 2006